

Gc
974.402
W89b

Gc
974.402
W89b
1151605

M. L.

GENEALOGY COLLECTION

(Worcester Co.)

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1833 01068 4733



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

Papers by Mr. Blake.

Incidents of the First and Second Settlements of
Worcester. With fac-similes.

Rutland and the Indian Troubles of 1723-30. Illus-
trated. (*In press.*)

PUBLISHED BY FRANKLIN P. RICE.

SOME
(Mass.)
WORCESTER MATTERS,

1689 - 1743.

By FRANCIS E. BLAKE.



WORCESTER, MASS. :
FRANKLIN P. RICE, *Publisher.*
MDCCCLXXXV.

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF
HONY WYMAN AND ALLEN COUNTRY, MD.

Read before THE WORCESTER SOCIETY OF ANTIQUITY, at a regular
meeting held April 7th, 1885.

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE

OF

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE

Worcester - 1885

SOME WORCESTER MATTERS,

1689 - 1743.

1151605

DANIEL GOOKIN, THE FIRST SHERIFF OF THE COUNTY.

Daniel Gookin was a son of Samuel Gookin, Esq., of Cambridge, and grandson of Major General Daniel Gookin. The date of his birth is unknown, but it is supposed to have been about the year 1700. His father was for several years Sheriff of Middlesex County, and his brother, Captain Samuel Gookin, Jr., an under-sheriff and keeper of the house of correction, while Daniel himself appears to have been employed in various duties about the jail and house of correction, having charge of the latter. Among the Middlesex Court Files are sundry bills rendered by him for repairs of the prison and for "diet" furnished certain prisoners. The frequent occurrence of the names of the father and his two sons savors somewhat of nepotism, and would at this day be duly considered by the public press.

On the 6th of July, 1731, Captain Daniel Gookin presented to the Court his account, amounting to fifty shillings, for services of keeping the house of correction to that date ; and from that time his name disappears from the records of Middlesex County, he having received, one week previous (June 30), the appointment

of Sheriff of the newly constituted County of Worcester. His training in the prison and house of correction at Cambridge, under the eye of his father, was, doubtless, considered by the Council in making the appointment.

There are but few facts now obtainable concerning Mr. Gookin, and these chiefly refer to his management of the responsible office of Sheriff.* His name first appears upon the records of the Court of Sessions of the new county in August, 1732, when he presented for approval his first account of expenditures. The following November, for some unexplained reason, he withdrew this account and substituted another, which was allowed by the Court.

This action would not be noticed but for the facts hereafter mentioned. His second account presented and allowed by the Court in November, 1733, is interesting as it shows a few of the duties of the Sheriff at that period. It is as follows : †

OCTOBER	<i>the County of Worcester</i>	<i>Dr</i>	£	S	D
1732	to Distributing 16 proclamations for thanksgiving		0	16	0
	to 21 County treasury Warrants		1	1	0
MARCH	to 16 proclamations for a fast		0	16	0
APRIL	to 16 precepts		1	12	0
1733	paid James Hamilton for Cloth for bedding		3	0	0
	to making the bed and Bolsters		0	6	0
	to Returning ye precepts		2	0	0
AUGUST	to 16 Tax bills & Country treasury Warrants		1	12	0
	to four blanketts for ye prison		5	4	0
Nov ^r	to 16 proclamations for thanksgiving		0	16	0
	Salary ending August 1733		5	0	0
	Keeping ye house of Corection nothing				
			22	3	0

DAN^l GOOKIN

Some items of record regarding Mr. Gookin's performance of official duty, which attracted my attention, may prove of interest to all, and instructive to those in similar positions of trust.

* In 1733 he had a house lot granted him near the present corner of Main and Park streets. See "Records of the Proprietors."

† The original is in the possession of the American Antiquarian Society.

On the 1st of July, 1737, Mr. John Wolcot, administrator of the estate of Captain Peter Papillon, deceased, made complaint to the Council that one Manassah Osmore, against whom he had recovered judgment, and who was committed to jail in Worcester by Sheriff Gookin, had "through the negligence or connivance of the Gaoler, made his escape & yo^r Petitioner could never yet understand it was thro' the Deficiency of the Gaol or that there was any break in the Gaol or any Lock broak"; and that he, the petitioner, had thereby lost all benefit of the judgment, and that the said Sheriff had taken no pains to secure the escaped prisoner. [Mass. Archives, vol. 41, page 219.]

Upon hearing this complaint the Council ordered the Sheriff to appear before them on the 14th instant, which date allowed thirteen days for service of notice. The following letter from Mr. Gookin, written on the 14th, shows the uncertainty of communication between the several towns in the Province, and what would be called to-day a slipshod method of attending to business.

May it please yo^r Excellency & Honourable Council

Last night at Ten of the Clock it Being the Thirteenth Instant (by the Hands of Coll^o Chandler) I Received a Copy of Mr Wolcots Petition Wherein it is your Excellencys & Hon^{ble} Councils pleasure to Direct me to appear Before your Excellency and the Hon^{ble} Council ye fourteenth Instant To make answer to s^d petition which is Impossible for me to do at such a short and sudden warning It very much Surprised me when I Saw ye Date of the order and no Longer Time to make my answer and should not Have Known it now if it had [not] been very accidentally Brought by Mr. Dwight a Tavern keeper in Boston who Told me it was Left at his house for Conveyance, but by whom he knows not. I would Therefore Humbly Intreat yo^r Excellency and y^r Hon^{ble} Council That that petition may be suspended untill I can have Time to make my answer to it.

I Humbly Begg yr Excellency and Hon^{rs} favour in this affair and Humbly Subscribe myself Yo^r Excellencys and Hon^{rs} most Dutifull and obedient Servt

DAN^l GOOKIN

Worcester July 14 1737

[Mass. Archives, vol. 105, page 148.]

The hearing was postponed from time to time until Oct. 6, 1737, when the Sheriff presented himself, and, "having made some ex-

cuses was ordered to withdraw & the complaint to ly for further Consideration"; and this, so far as the records are concerned, appears to be the end of that affair.

On the 4th of April, 1740, a similar complaint against the Sheriff was made by Hezekiah Maynard, but on the 17th instant Mr. Maynard acknowledged that he had received the amount of his judgment, and appeared satisfied. However, upon the same day, Mr. Paul Brintnall complained that the Sheriff had liberated from jail one James Holden, Jr., of Worcester, against whom he had recovered judgment in the sum of £33, 17, 1; that he had made frequent applications for his money, but had received only £23. He adds: "Unless aided by the Justice of your Excellency & Honours [he] is well assured that He shall never get one farthing more altho' your Petitioner shall sue him. The demonstration of which arises from the Office He Sustains & the Circumstances He is in. Wherefore as he is an officer appointed by your Excellency & Honours as it is a most Grievous thing that the subject should be put to their Action for all the Money he gets into His hands by force of any Executions committed to him he prays the Compassionate & just regards of your Excellency & Honours to a whole Country & Province by the amendment or removal of so bad an officer & as in duty bound shall ever pray."

The Council thereupon directed the Secretary to write to Mr. Gookin, and order him to appear before them the following week. The letter of the Secretary is here given:

BOSTON APRIL 17 1740.

Sir

I am directed by the Gov^r & Council to acquaint you that they are much displeased with you that your Conduct gives them so much Trouble of hearing so many Complaints. And that if you don't presently reform, they will take Care to remedy these things by putting in an other Officer in your room.

Your humble Servant

J. WILLARD.

The Sheriff, however, did not appear at the time named, and an order was sent him to attend the Council at its next meeting the following week "upon pain of their highest Displeasure." The

displeasure of the honorable body must have been great when they found upon the day fixed that Mr. Gookin had concluded not to come to Boston in person, but had sent a letter instead. This letter read as follows :

APRIL 29, 1741.

May it please yo^r Excellency and your Hon^{ble} Council These may Certify That I have paid Mr Brintnall his Debt & Charges as yo^r Excellency and Hon^{rs} will see by his Receipt I Do Heartily acknowledge That it was by my means that mr Holding was Dismist out of Gaol His parents Came to me (They being my near neighbours) and was so Concerned for their son being in prison and were grieved and made so many promises for the Speedy payment of the Remaining part of the Debt That I had Compassion on their aged Tears and Did upon their promise Dismiss him but Their failing of their promise has put me to this Cost and Trouble.

I Do Therefore Humbly Intreat yo^r Excellency and Hon^{rs} to Take these Lines into yo^r wise Consideration and according to yo^r Great Clemency and Goodness Have Compassion on me and family and wherein I have offended yo^r Excellency and Hon^{rs} and any Others I will by Divine assistance Do so no more Mr Brintnall might had his money when he was up the Last Time but Refus^d it it was offerd him as yo^r Excellency and Hon^{rs} may see on ye Back of the Complaints But being instigated by some malicious persons as is by Every body supposed would not Take it for it was Thought would be a means of my being Dismis^d from my office; I Therefore Humbly Intreat yo^r Excellency and Hon^r that you would be pleas^d in yo^r Great wisdom to Continue me Still and I Shall (in all Regards) indeavor a universall amendment for the Time to Come upon all accounts

I am yo^r Excellency's and Hon^{rs} most unworthy (tho' most obedient) Serv^t

DAN^l GOOKIN

[Mass. Archives, vol. 41, page 509.]

This letter was accompanied by certificates of Joshua Eaton, Jr. and Isaac Barnard that the complaint of Mr. Brintnall had been read to Mr. Gookin, and an acknowledgment of Mr. Brintnall (witnessed by Caleb Johnson and William Jennison) that he had received the money claimed by him. There is also a brief note from William Jennison stating that Mr. Brintnall might have had his money five days before, but would not take it because Mr. Gookin was unwilling to pay £8. for charge and trouble.

The Council peremptorily ordered the Sheriff to be present at the meeting on the 29th of May next following, and Mr. Gookin

appears to have been sufficiently impressed by the order, and made his appearance. The Council record reads [May 29, 1740] : "Daniel Gookin Esq^r Sheriff of the County of Worcester, being by the order of this Board of the first of May last required to attend this Board to answer for his disobedience in not appearing personally upon divers summons as also for his neglect & misconduct in his office, appeared this day and after he was heard in answer to these complaints, His Excell^{cy} admonish^d him for his ill conduct and warned him against such behaviour for the time to come lest he should render himself utterly unworthy of his office."

Notwithstanding this reprimand, within two weeks another complaint was made that he had paid over only a portion of a debt recovered in a case (Andrew Caverly vs. Thomas Harback and James Waite of Worcester), but no action appears on the records ; and in October following, a similar complaint was preferred by Joseph Crosby, of Worcester, which was subsequently dismissed by the Council.

Accompanying this last complaint is the following interesting letter addressed to Governor Belcher by Hon. John Chandler, the Chief Justice :

WORCESTER JANUARY 26th 1740/1

May It Please Your Excellency

S^r

I am very sensible Mr Sheriff Gookin has some enemies in this County as well as myself; I suppose we are envied because we (by your Excellency's favour) enjoy Posts of Profit within the same.

I humbly apprehend if it be True what he tells me as doubtless tis, our neighbor Crosby had no Reason to Complain; However that be, yet I would humbly beg leave to inform your Excellency, that his conduct since he was before your Excellency and the Honourable Board is less Exceptionable then before.

I humbly ask your Excellencys Pardon for making this Excuse for Mr Gookin, when my own conduct is so Liable to Exceptions.

But Relying upon your Excellencys great Goodness to excuse mine,

I am S^r your Excellencys

most Hum^{le} Obed^t & Dutifull Servant

JOHN CHANDLER

The reason for Judge Chandler's allusion to his own conduct being liable to exceptions, was on account of his connection with the Land Bank Scheme, to which I shall presently refer.

With this gratifying statement of the Judge that Mr. Gookin had made some improvement in the management of his office, we must leave the subject, trusting that before his death in June, 1743,* he became a model Sheriff.

The inventory of his estate, presented by Jabez Tatman, shows a value of only £134. in all, which indicates that he did not grow rich during his administration. In the settlement of the estate no mention is made of his wife or children, although he had four children in Cambridge.

MANUFACTORY BILLS OR LAND BANK SCHEME.

In the year 1740 the Province of Massachusetts Bay was passing through a period of financial difficulties occasioned by an over-issue of paper currency, whereby the credit of the Province was placed in a lamentable condition. Many schemes to meet the exigency and relieve the distress were proposed and abandoned; and to add to the difficulty of the situation, Governor Belcher and his Council were not in accord with the views of the House as to the solution of the problem.

Among the plans proposed by private individuals was that known as the Manufactory Company or Land Bank Scheme. This company was organized with about four hundred partners, with the design to loan the sum of £150,000 on notes on land security, payable in twenty years in various articles of merchandise. The Governor was bitterly opposed to this company, and issued proclamations denouncing it as a fraud, and enjoining upon all in the civil and military service of the Province to discountenance it in every way upon peril of dismissal.

Among the papers in the State Archives are lists returned by Registers of Deeds of all mortgages recorded in behalf of this

*June 17th, 1743, the Council had notice of his death, and on the 23d appointed Benjamin Flagg as his successor.

company. In these lists the names of many Worcester men appear, among them the following : Daniel Bigelow, Robert Barber, Daniel Boyden, John Boyden, Luke Brown, Palmer Goulding, Elisha Hedge, James How, William Johnson, James Holden, Henry Lee, James Moore, Matthias Rice, Eliakim Rice, Gershom Rice, Jr., Jotham Rice, John Stearns, Daniel Ward.

The Bank proved a sad failure either from the unsoundness of its basis, or the determined opposition of the Governor, or from both causes.

My object in bringing this to your notice is to present letters from three gentlemen holding official positions in Worcester, showing their relations to the scheme, and with what spirit they "faced the music." The first letter is from William Jennison, Esq., one of the Justices of the Court of Common Pleas ; the second from Chief Justice John Chandler ; and the third from Henry Lee, Esq., one of the Justices of the Peace.

On the 6th of January, 1740/1, by order of the Council, letters were addressed by the Secretary to the several Courts in the Province, instructing them "to take all convenient opportunities and methods both when in Court, and when separate to prevent the spreading of the great Fraud & particularly you are desired strictly to charge your officers by no means to pass receive or countenance the said Bills." [Mass. Archives, vol. 102, page 130.]

In addition to this circular letter, it is very probable that specific charges were brought to the notice of the three gentlemen above named.

Mr. Jennison's reply was as follows :

WORCESTER JANUARY ye 9th 1740[1]

Honored Sir

This day I Received yours wherein your honour Informs me that his Exlency the Govenour and the Hono^{le} Council are informed that I haue in Couriged the passing of the bills called manifactory bills over His Excellencys proclamation to warn all offesors in the Gouverment against In coriging the same Honrd Sir this is to inform your honour thet be fou^r nor sen his Excellencys procklimation I never did anything to in Corige the pasing of S^d bills for I never Licked them so well neather was I any way concerned about that afayor for I never Licked the Skeme that was

Laid about S^d bills I can't say but I have sum time past Reseved sum of S^d bills but at this time I han't one of them and had youre honour not wrot to me about them I had Concluded not to have tacken them any moore

I am Redy to answer any Complaint made against me on that account sir & that I have write is the truth of the mater honored sir pray Give my duty to his Excellency and the hon^{ble} Council and Sir I am your H^{on}ours most

humbel Saruant

WILLIAM JENNISON

[Mass. Archives, vol. 102, page 132. This letter is in Mr. Jennison's handwriting.]

Judge Chandler's reply was :

WORCESTER JAN^y 10th 1740/1

Hon^{bl} Sr

Your letter of ye 6th Instant I Rec^d by Oliver Partridge Esq. and in answer to it would Humbly say.

I account it my Hon^r and Happiness to have such for my Judges in this affair, as I am Sure will hear me with Patience and give Judgment with mercy; So agreeable to their Known Justice, goodness & Clemency.

The Truth of ye affair is this; vizt; the night before I was called before ye Governour and Councill I was Accidentally in Company with Capt Blanchard & two or three people living his way, and discoursing about the Line between This, & the province of New Hampshire, as Lately Settled by the King in Councill, I ask'd him whither Groton Gore so called, being a Tract of Land Lately Granted by the Generall Court would fall into New Hampshire, he said it would. I Replyed, I have one hundred Acres of Land in said Gore, and since it falls out of the province, I w^d sell it him for Just what he w^d give, & if he said Twas worth nothing, he should have it free or words to that effect. After a few words pass'd, he Reply'd I will give you four pound in Manufactory Bills & no more. I told him he had my word, and I would not go back, accordingly he paid me the Same at that time. The next day & soon after Mr. Blanchard* had been before ye Gov^r & Councill, my Self being sent for also, I desired him to keep ye money till I had been up, being under Surprise & concern, but as the property was in me the Night before and as I informed the Hon^{bl} Board how much I had in which Sum was included Said four pounds, I apprehended I did not Break my promis in taking what was my own before I believe I told this To the Hon^{bl} Sam^l Danforth Esq^r in Mr. Blanchards presence in order to set the matter in a True Light. I would Add that before Capt Blanchard & my Self had finished our Bargain Mr Partridge

* Mr. Blanchard lost his position through his connection with the scheme.

I think came into ye same Room and heard Something of the Affair, & I left him with Mr. Blanchard and the other people.

This may it please Your Hon^r. is the Truth of this Story, if it is a Crime twas done in a Surprize, I hope my thus frankly discovering ye whole matter will not be improved to my disgrace or hurt, but Rather intitle me to favour, and Especially Since in answer to ye last Clause in your Hon^{rs} Letter: I do with great freeness Sincerity and Honesty declare that I will not give countenance directly or indirectly to the Bills called Land Bank or Manufactory Bills. This is my firm and finall Resolution in the affair.

I am Hon^{bl} S^r

Your very humble
most Obliged and

Obed^t Ser^t

To the Hon^{bl}

JOHN CHANDLER

Josiah Willard Esq^r.

[Mass. Archives, vol. 102, page 133. This letter is a fine specimen of penmanship.]

The following is Mr. Lee's letter :

From Henry Lee to Hon Josiah Willard, Secretary &c
Sir

In obedience to yours of April 3^d I hereby Inform your Honour that haveing to the Best of my Power strictly Examined the Manufactory Scheam with all the Proceedings on it I am fully of opinion 'tis well calculated to serve the Interest of the Province and therefore am determined to do what I can to Encourage it and think that the Priviledge of an Englishman is my Suffishant warrant therefor espechally as it is not Contrary to aney lawfull Authority to do so for I never heard that the undertakers had evere a hering therefore think it impossible they should be condemned as yet—

As I act my conscience I Regard being Punished aney way for Differing in my opinion from the Governor and Council to be a Civil Persecution and to be deprived of my office untell I be Proved unfaithfull in it or have violate the laws of the Land I Look on as an invasion of my Native Rights But on the whole I think it [degrading?] your honours to aney man to sustain an office which must obledge him to so grate a meanness as blindly to follow the Inclinations of those above him tho not Prescribed much less Supported by Laws therefore to sacrifice my Post for the Servis of my Cuntry is Infinitely more Honourable then to keep it on such Base Conditionts I am S^r your

Humb^l Servant

Worcester Apl 14: 1741

HENRY LEE

[Mass. Archives, vol. 102, page 153. This letter is not in Mr. Lee's handwriting, but his signature is affixed to it.]

Without passing judgment upon the letters of Messrs. Jennison and Chandler, most certainly that of Mr. Lee is worthy of our highest commendation. The spirit manifested by him indicates his manliness in living up to his convictions of right; that same spirit which has given inspiration to multitudes under trial, and has led brave men to face dangers fearful and foes most bitter.

The explanations of Messrs. Jennison and Chandler were, doubtless, satisfactory; but we can imagine the reception accorded to Mr. Lee's, and scarcely need to read that at a meeting of the Council, April 30, 1741, after hearing the above letter read, it was voted that Henry Lee be "dismissed and removed from his office of a Justice of the Peace in the County of Worcester."

PALMER GOULDING'S CURE.

In 1734 Palmer Goulding, of Worcester, petitioned the General Court for a gift of land in consideration of his making known an "infallible cure" for the bite of the rattlesnake. He failed to obtain what he desired, but in 1741 made another attempt, and presented the following petition:

"Palmer Goulding to General Court Sept 23 1741.

"The memoriall of Palmer Goulding of Worcester Humbly Sheweth

"That your memorialist in his travills, has with a Considerable Cost, attained to Such Skill and Knowledge, in the Curing the bite of a Ratle Snake, that were he present when a person was bit, he Could So soon Efectually Cure it, that y^e person would never be Sensible of any hurt, and the Same medison if Ritely aplyed, has no les operation on y^e Body of men to Cure any Enflamation of y^e blood, or to prevent or Cure any breiding Sore Whatsoever. a womans Sore brest or fever Sores, it is allso an Enfallible medison to Cure or prevent the Coming of fistilorr or pole Evill in horses, which Knowledge he is very willing to Communicate for y^e good of mankind But inasmuch as he was Really at Considerable

Cost in gaining y^e same, he most humbly prays your Excellency and Honers, would upon his So doing, be pleased to make him a grant of Sum of the wild and uncultivated Lands of the Province, and your memorialist will Cheerfully Submit to Such terms or conditions Respecting Setling, as your Excellency and Honers In your Great Wisdom Shall think proper & as in Duty Bound Shall Ever pray &c

PALMER GOULDING"

[Mass. Archives, vol. 105, page 168.]

The House of Representatives ordered that a tract of two hundred acres of land be granted Mr. Goulding upon certain conditions, and with the proviso that he should give such a description of the medicine that it might be publicly known, and bring credible proof of his having successfully applied the remedy in the several cases mentioned in the memorial, "whereof yet there is no certain demonstration."

The Council refused to concur, but the matter was again brought up the following year and passed. I fail, however, to find any record of a survey or plan of land returned by Mr. Goulding, possibly because of his inability to satisfy the authorities as to the value of his discovery.

Accompanying these petitions are quite a number of certificates to the efficacy of the medicine. John Gray, of Worcester, had a heifer bitten in one of her feet by a rattlesnake, and Mr. Goulding gave her "some boiled herbs & cured her." Jacob Holmes was equally fortunate with a steer, after using a "root about y^e Bigness of a wallnut"; and John Durkin certified that some one gave him a horse that had been bitten by a rattlesnake, and after Mr. Goulding had applied his remedies the creature "became a *Considerable Horse again.*"

There are other certificates of equal value from men residing in the neighboring towns. It would be interesting to know if this remedy was ever disclosed to the public, or if the descendants of Mr. Goulding, still living in Worcester, can throw any light upon the matter.

PETITION OF INHABITANTS OF THE GORE.

The following is a copy of a petition of several inhabitants of the Gore between Sutton and Worcester, asking to be annexed to the latter town.

"February 14 : 1742/3

“To the _____ of Worcester etc.

“The Humble Petition of us y^e

Subscribers being Propriators of Lands in the County of worcester & Adjoyning to said Town of worcester and are now Living on said Land Called the County Goar and several of us having part of our Lands in Said Town of worcester and what priuelidge we have Allredy Received, both sivel and Ecliseastical we Redeily acknowldg we have Received in said Town of worcester from both minister & people which lays us under Strong obligations to offer our Selves with our Lands Lying in Said Gore to be annexed to Said Town of worcester as a part of Said Town both to doe Duty and Receive priuelidg if y^e Hon^{tbl} General Court So order it.

“Gentlm our Desire & Request is that the Town of worcester will take our Difficult Circumstances in such a Dark and Difficult day as this is under Consideration and So far Incourage us as to pass a vote of said Town with Submission to General Court to accept of us & our lands aforesd to be annexed as a part of said Town of worcester both to doe Duty & to Receive priuelidges Equil to other Inhabitents of said Town——

“And Further to appoint a Comittee to Preffer a Petition with us the Subscribers to the grate and General Court in order to obtain y^e desired End or any other way that the Town in their wisdom Shall think best to obtain an act of y^e General Court for that purpose

“Gent^l^m we offer one thing more to your Consideration which Incouriges us to ask such a feauour ; besides the peace and good order, those is in y^e Church and Town which is Sufficiant wear there no other—part of y^e aforesd land was formerly Remoued by y^e General Court from y^e place whear your meetinghouse now

stands for y^e accomodating of your Town, to y^e place, and being part of y^e land above mentioned & with that Reserve that it Joynd to worcester ; which seems to us strongly Impliyed by y^e General Court that it was their Intention that part of said Land Last mentioned should be annexed to the Town of worcester if not part of sd Town

"And as in Duty bound shall ever pray &c

"a true Coppy Exam^d

"~~o~~ Jonas Rice T Cl

"EPHRIM CURTIS

"THOMAS RICHARDSON

"DANIL BOYDEN

"TIMOTHY GREEN

"JOHN BARBER

"JABEZ TATMAN

"MATTHIAS RICE"

[Mass. Archives, vol. 115, page 9. The Petition to the General Court for this object is in Mass. Archives, vol. 115, pages 22-23. A copy is printed in "Early Records of the Town of Worcester," Book II., page 38. It will be found in the second volume of The Worcester Society of Antiquity's Collections.] *

ADDITIONAL ITEMS.

The following items escaped my notice while preparing the paper entitled *Incidents of the First and Second Settlements of Worcester*, read before the Society last year.

"July 22, 1689. Ordered that six men be allowed for the strengthening of the Garrison at Worcester until farther orders.

"Sept. 1, 1689 10^{lb} powder & shot to be furnished to Capt Wing & Serg^t Edw^d Taylor, John Pym, and John Carely were dismissed from prison upon the promise to go out with Cap^{ne} Wing to y^e Garrison at Worcester.

* The original petition of the inhabitants of the north part of Worcester, now Holden, for incorporation as a district or town, with accompanying papers, is in Mass. Archives, vol. 114, pages 525, 558, 590. The documents are printed in full in the History of Holden.

"Aug 9, 1689. Cap^{ne} Wing have six of the soldiers late drawn off from Sagadahock to be sett up to the Reliefe of Worchester And that Captain Wing discharge their Quarters : And dispose of them for the safety of said place. Cap^{ne} Timothy Prout is likewise ordered to deliver to Cap^{ne} Wing Ten pound of powder and a proportionable Quantity of Shott for the use of Worchester.

"Oct 25, 1691. In answer to Capt Jno Wing his petⁿ ordered that Capt Penn Townsend Capt Ephraim Hunt and decon John Haynes be aded to Capt Jn^o prentice mr Adam Winthrop Capt Jn^o Wing [who] were appointed to be of a Comittee for the ordering and settling of the plantation called Worchester Anny four of them being fully Impowered to Act in that affair according to former order of this Court."

[Mass. Archives, vol. 81 : Council Records.]

The names of Mr. Townsend and Mr. Hunt have not before appeared in the lists of committees for managing Worcester affairs.

#309







